

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

EUGENE DIVISION

MICHAEL EVANS,

Petitioner,

v.

GUY HILL, Superintendent,

Respondent.

MOSMAN, J.,

No. 6:15-cv-00500-JE

OPINION AND ORDER

On February 23, 2016, Magistrate Judge Jelderks issued his Findings and Recommendation (F&R) [21], recommending Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus [1] should be DISMISSED. No objections to the Findings and Recommendation were filed.

DISCUSSION

The magistrate judge makes only recommendations to the court, to which any party may file written objections. The court is not bound by the recommendations of the magistrate judge, but retains responsibility for making the final determination. The court is generally required to make a *de novo* determination regarding those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). However, the court is not required to review, *de novo* or under any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the F&R to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). While the level of scrutiny under which I am required to review the F&R

depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, I am free to accept, reject, or modify any part of the F&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

Upon review, I agree with Judge Jelderks's recommendation and I ADOPT the F&R [21] as my own opinion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 18th day of March, 2016.

/s/ Michael W. Mosman
MICHAEL W. MOSMAN
Chief United States District Judge